

**CITY OF BROKEN ARROW
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MINUTES
January 23, 2003**

The Planning Commission Agenda for this meeting was posted on January 21, 2003, at 10:00 a.m. on the City Hall Bulletin Board, 220 S. First Street.

1. The Broken Arrow Planning Commission met on Thursday, January 23, 2003, at 5:00 p.m.
2. Present: Robert Goranson, Chairman
Renate Caldwell, Vice Chairperson
Mike Lester, Commission Member
Kal Desai, Commission Member
Johnnie Parks, Commission Member

Absent: None

Staff Present: Farhad K. Daroga, City Planner
Brent Murphy, Ass't City Planner
Karl Fritschen, Staff Planner
Joyce Snider, Admin Ass't
April Parnell, Assistant City Attorney
Justin Cook, City Engineer
Joseph Watt, Assistant City Engineer
3. The Commission considered the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held January 9, 2003. **Motion** by Mike Lester to approve the January 9, 2003, minutes as presented. Motion seconded by Johnnie Parks.
Yes: Parks, Desai, Lester, Caldwell, Goranson
No: None
Motion Approved
4. The Commission considered the Consent Agenda. Farhad Daroga reviewed each item on the Consent Agenda.

Motion by Mike Lester to approve the Consent Agenda, as recommended by Staff, excluding Item 4A. Motion seconded by Kal Desai.
Yes: Parks, Desai, Lester, Caldwell, Goranson
No: None
Motion approved
- 4A. PT03-100, DN03-100, Piper Addition preliminary plat, 1.08 acres, 1 lot, C-3, (BAZ 1446) 904 West Kenosha Street, Ronald G. Tracy (Engineer). The applicant was not present. This item was removed from the Consent Agenda as requested by the applicant prior to this meeting.

- 4B. PT02-125, DN02-206, H. Cecil Rhoades Elementary School conditional final plat, 9.70 acres, 1 lot, R-3, 320 East Midway Avenue, Crafton, Tull & Associates (Engineer). The applicant was present. This item was approved as recommended by Staff.
- 4C. ST03-100, DN02-213 site plan, 12.0 acres, I-1, Air Cool Exchangers, (ACE) Inc., 1201 South 9th Street, Thomas D. Self (Applicant/Owner). The applicant was not present. This item was approved as recommended by Staff.
- 4D.. BAL 823, DN02-219, R-1, 1509 East Freeport (Freeport Street and 15th Street, Sue Crews (Applicant/Owner). The applicant was present. This item was approved as recommended by Staff.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

- 5. The Commission considered BAZ 1579, PUD 134, Arlington Court, (BACP 44) 8.82 acres, R-1 to R-4 and PUD, between 67th Street and 68th Street, on the east side of Olive Avenue, Hall, Rosenbaum & Associates, LLC (Applicant). Farhad Daroga presented the background, saying this matter was reviewed under Comprehensive Plan change recently, as BACP 44, which changed the designation of this property from Level 1 to Level 2, subject to development through the PUD process. The PUD is for a private street, gated single-family community on small lots, with the main entrance on 68th Street with secondary access on 67th Street and will be served by City water and sewer. He said a conceptual site plan has been submitted.

Roy Johnsen, attorney representing the applicant, David Markle, said this is an infill tract which has been undeveloped to date. He said Horseshoe Acres was developed while in the County, without platting or City utilities and that there is a distinction between the frontage, undeveloped, property and the interior, Horseshoe Acres. He said the undeveloped property fronts Olive Avenue (129th Street), which the City Engineer has advised, is scheduled for improvement and talked about other planned development along Olive Avenue, little of it residential. He said there is little market for large lot residential on an arterial street, with the physical facts that exist in this area. Mr. Johnsen reviewed Staff past recommendations of approval of this project and said the nine conditions recommended have been met, except for a few minor interior design issues.

Mr. Johnsen said Condition No. 3 regarding alleyways (Alleyways meet the minimum area for maneuvering two lanes of traffic and backup space. However, this may pose to be a problem if all dwelling units are built on the building line.) has been dealt with through widening the alleys to 24 feet, which meets conventional standards.

Mr. Johnsen said Condition No. 4 (The gated entryway design should accommodate a turnaround before the gate structure (or near the call box).) will be met.

Mr. Johnsen said in regard to Condition No. 2 (The concept plan shows a 13-foot front building line through the PUD. Though this front setback is possible, it will result in an unaesthetic and impractical development scheme. In high-density projects, building setback lines should be staggered.) some staggering will happen because of the different floor plans.

5. continued

Mr. Johnsen said 58 units is below what could be built in this (R-4 district). He said in regard to storm drain requirements, the project engineers maintain that the City's requirements to not adversely impact upstream or downstream, will be met and will be resolved during the platting process. He said it appears that onsite detention is feasible and will be done and that will resolve the drainage issue. In answer to Bob Goranson's question, he said several options had been studied, including onsite, or west to a proposed regional facility. He said two lots will be lost and he is ready to amend the project to include 56 lots (rather than the 58 previously proposed). He said this will also provide more turnaround room at the entrance. He said he feels all of the interior design issues have been addressed.

Mr. Johnsen summarized, saying this project has been carefully conceived: Arlington Court is a gated, single-family detached residential community, with masonry exteriors and a streetscape free of garage doors, an English country theme, a people-oriented place. He said this is a fairly flat, treeless piece of property, fully exposed to an arterial street and he outlined the characteristics of the project, using a visual presentation. He said this is a piece of property that has stayed vacant and will continue to do so unless an approach such as this is approved. He said he thought it could be done in a way that will have no negative impact on the neighborhood and bring very desirable development to Broken Arrow.

Jason Aamodt, 1145 South Cheyenne, Tulsa, attorney representing J. D. Lind and Linda Stillwell, in opposition to this project, quoted Section 25313 of Ordinance 2443 on stormwater management for the City, which states "the following standards shall apply to all new subdivision proposals adjacent to regulatory flood areas," as this project is, and Section C states that all subdivision proposals shall have adequate drainage provided to reduce exposure to flood hazard. In Section E it states that adequate overflow and access routes to flood plains will be provided in subdivision lands and that paving of overflow and access routes may be required by local administrator. He said in looking at this subdivision proposal, there is no provision for adequate drainage to provide for reduction of flood hazard. He said in Section 25201D, it says that the stormwater drainage system for the City of Broken Arrow shall be designed so that property owners located downstream and upstream from the development shall not be injuriously affected by the construction, operation, or maintenance of such system. He said if this project is approved only with general representation of onsite retention, without providing for how that detention will be built, this project should not be approved without a hydrologic study. He submitted copies to the Planning Commission and Staff of a document titled "Hydrologic Study for J.D. Lind and 67th and 68th Neighborhood Association for Horseshoe Acres Development, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, dated November 2002.

Mr. Aamodt referred to page 7 of the Study and said this hydrologic survey which shows clearly that the proposed development, without any detention, will not be able to contain within creek banks and will cause flooding.

Bob Goranson explained that what is being considered is a Planned Unit Development and a rezoning request. He said while it is necessary for the developer to show proper detention of stormwater, that is done during the platting process and what Mr. Aamodt has presented is a known factor. He said this project will go through the City Engineer.

5. continued

Justin Cook said the developer is not required to review stormwater related issues during the Comprehensive Plan amendment, planned unit development or rezoning stages. He said this developer did a great deal of work on this project even before they applied for a Comprehensive Plan amendment. He said his staff has held detailed discussions with the developer and the engineer who completed the hydrology study quoted tonight and that this issue is one that should be dealt with at the platting stage.

Bob Goranson agreed that it is an important issue, but this is not the time to talk about it. He said they know there will be additional runoff whenever construction takes place, but there are additional studies the developer will need to complete.

Justin Cook said the stormwater program was authored in his office and he and his staff are very conscientious about stormwater issues and law and no development will be allowed to break that law.

Mr. Aamodt said his clients' problem is that this plan does not contain any process for maintaining or containing stormwater and because of that, it is not in proper form. He requested that the applicants make proper provisions in this plan for the management of stormwater for consideration by the City Council. He said it is part of the planning process, although it is correct that the actual design plans and how it is all going to work is part of the process that comes through during the platting process and preliminary construction plans.

Bob Goranson said the developer must design and build the project in accordance with subdivision regulations and the Zoning Ordinance, and must be approved by the City Engineer. Discussion followed regarding how stormwater detention requirements might affect the project and Mr. Aamodt requested that the applicant be required to complete a hydrologic study and the results included in a submittal to the Planning Commission to avoid complications later.

Bob Goranson again explained the planning process to Mr. Aamodt and Mr. Aamodt again expressed concerns regarding the need for a study at this point and discussion followed.

Mike Lester asked if, according to the report (Study), onsite detention was needed on this eight acres. Mr. Aamodt said yes. Mike Lester said then, if the developer addresses these issues at some point in time, they will have addressed the issues presented in this report. Mr. Aamodt said, perhaps, but the issues presented in this report have existed for a long time, ones that require careful attention and of which the developer is aware and they haven't been addressed to avoid future problems, damage, etc.

Mike Lester said these issues will be address through the City's normal process and asked Mr. Aamodt if all of these drainage issues are related only to this eight-acre tract and Mr. Aamodt said they are. He said the engineer looked at the slope locations on site and indicated the drainage from the northern portion of the site is going off to Haikey Creek, the drainage from the southern portion is going to Floral Creek and the drainage from the central portion will go over 129th East (Olive) Avenue.

Mike Lester said that is what is happening in its natural state. Mr. Aamodt said that is so. However, in its natural state the site has a great capacity to absorb stormwater because it is an open field and if it is developed, an enormous portion of this site will be paved or roofed with impervious materials, so the water will be forced to flow off the site. Discussion followed and Renate Caldwell said the PUD is an idea, or concept.

5. continued

Justin Cook said the drawing shows the top of three basins coming together on this tract. The topographic the basins were drawn from and identified in the report was a 1977 aerial photo, is plus or minus five feet and there is less than two feet of differential grade across this site. It is the top of the basin for three major basins in excess of 600 acres and this is a ten-acre site, so those lines are very premature at this point because it has not been surveyed; the report did not survey it. The actual directional flow of water will be identified by the developer when they do the site topographical. He said he thinks what Mr. Aamodt is indicating is that there will have to be detention in three different locations and that may not be true. It may be possible to do detention in one basin and compensate for all basins or it may be need to be done in all three. That will be determined during the platting stage. He said he understands Mr. Aamodt's concern regarding the location of the detention pond and said his clarification is that it is not 100% accurate because the data utilized for this report was not of grade to identify that type of information.

Jim King, 6712 South 136th East Avenue, Broken Arrow, asked if PUD 134 and BAZ 1579 were being handled together and Bob Goranson said they were. Mr. King said Mr. Johnsen said this property was an infill and he disagreed with that. He said , in regard to the PUD, this project would involve serious overbuilding, involves far too many houses, is incompatible with the neighborhood and with the Comprehensive Plan, which has gradients built in to avoid low density side by side with high density. He said this would cause traffic problems during rush hours, will create surface runoff and backwater flooding, place an unsightly wall in an attractive neighborhood, it is a high risk venture, with no provision to prevent subsidized housing, with attendant crime it would cause. It envisions grounds upkeep by a homeowners association but has no provisions for enforcement.

Mr. King said, in regard to the rezoning request, the change from R-1 to R-4 is totally inappropriate in this location and that it would be a violation of the intent of the Comprehensive Plan to put high density housing adjacent to low density housing and there is no point in having a Comprehensive Plan if its main tenets are not followed. He said there is no R-4 zoning anywhere in this area and outlined the uses surrounding the area and said traffic would be exacerbated and widening Olive is far in the future. A better option would be larger lots with the same plan, or conventional development with upscale homes. He urged the Commission to deny the rezoning request and the PUD and talked about the Commission's obligation to the residents, the City and to those who develop residential and commercial projects in the City for profit.

Mike Lester asked Mr. King why that area has not developed before. Mr. King said there has been no urgency to do so and it has been on septic until the last year and the property owner was not ready to sell. Mike Lester said he thought if it was a viable area, it would have been developed. Mr. King said he didn't know. Discussion followed.

Jake Kiskin, 1320 East 68th Street, Broken Arrow, said what if he has a flood? He said this issue should be looked at before development takes place because afterward it will be too late. He said the neighborhood will be destroyed by this project. He asked the Commission to deny this project.

Ernest Myers, 13003 East 67th Street, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding flooding, the esthetics in that if a wall is constructed, he will not be able to enjoy his neighborhood as all he will see is a six-foot wall with rooftops above it. He said it will lower the value of his home and his enjoyment of it and 58 homes is far too many homes to put on eight acres. He urged the Commission to deny this application.

Bob Goranson left the meeting at 6:12 p.m.

5.continued

J. D. Lind, 13507 E. 68th Street, Broken Arrow, answered Mike Lester's question (about why this area had not developed previously) saying the last house built in the area was not built in the woods and several people would have bought the property had they known it was for sale to build large homes.

Terry Massingale, 13516 East 68th Street, Broken Arrow, said the PUD shows the main entrance directly across the street from property he owns on 68th Street and on which he plans to build a luxury home. He said the PUD should be denied and the rezoning request should be denied as well. He said R-4 zoning will negatively impact his neighborhood.

Kal Desai asked why the entrance was changed from 129th to 68th. Farhad Daroga said the distance between 68th and 67th where they exit on 129th are two close together to allow another exit between them and it would cause a safety hazard. He said it is a design and traffic safety issue.

Johnnie Parks said he understood the safety issue but it would have isolated this development better with the principal entrance on 129th. He asked if there have been other situations that warrant that type of safety precaution. Farhad Daroga said Police Department staff constantly visits with Planning Staff about that. They do not like the turning movements in some areas like this one. He said it is for the safety of all those traveling on 129th. Justin Cook said a similar situation was on 71st Street, west of Lancaster that would have resulted in hazards and talked about safety and flow issues. Johnnie Parks asked how often a similar situation occurs. Farhad Daroga said infill development projects such as this are not seen often and talked about several of them. Discussion followed regarding development issues.

Farhad Daroga with the City Council approval of Level 2, the requested zoning of R-4 is in compliance with the plan and the PUD, so Staff recommends approval of BAZ 1579 in conjunction with PUD 134. He said Staff recommends conceptual approval of PUD 134, because the applicant has dealt with the Staff concerns expressed in the staff report, having lowered the number of units to 56, the front building line will be staggered due to different building lines, the alleys will meet the minimum of 24 feet width, and the gated entryway design will need to be looked at in detail. These are items the applicant has agreed to work with and Staff can recommend approval. He said in regard to the number of units, 58 units with off-site detention, or 56 units with on-site detention, or another number, density could be a policy issue, without the stormwater detention issue.

Mike Lester asked is the project is being considered with 58 units. Farhad Daroga said, as it was submitted to the Commission, it is 58 units, but revised to 56. Mike Lester said he thought this addition could co-exist with the existing neighborhood, based on his own experience, that he has an addition like this on each end of his and it has not adversely affected the price of houses in his addition, has been harmonious and has not caused a traffic problem.

Motion by Mike Lester to recommend approval of BAZ 1579 and PUD 134 to allow them to move forward. The motion was seconded by Renate Caldwell. Johnnie Parks commented that he likes PUDs because they lock in a development.

Yes: Parks, Desai, Lester, Caldwell

No: None

Motion approved

5. continued

Renate Caldwell said this matter would be considered by the City Council on February 17, 2003.

Roy Johnsen said he would be out of town on the 17th. Renate Caldwell announced that this item would be heard by the City Council on March 3, 2003.

6. The Commission considered BAZ 1585, PUD 133, Cacy Mini-storage, 20.30 acres, (BACP 42) A-1 to IS, FD and PUD, immediately north of the Creek Turnpike on the east side of 9th Street (Lynn Lane/177th East Avenue) Lewis Engineering (Applicant). Farhad Daroga presented the background, saying this is a self storage project that was continued from the last meeting so the applicant could bring in a revised proposed. He said the revised text is included in the agenda packets, and was submitted after the agenda packets were distributed. He said the revised text matches the design statement and the PUD, as contemplated and reviewed through the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Brent Murphy said all of the comments in the Staff report have been addressed in the revised text submitted.

Bill Lewis, Lewis Engineering, 5879 South Garnett, Tulsa, the project engineer, said the client agreed with all the Staff comments and the PUD text has been revised and they request approval. There were no protestants present.

Farhad Daroga said Staff recommends approval with the submitted revised text.

Motion by Johnnie Parks to recommend approval of BAZ 1585 and PUD 133 as recommended by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mike Lester.

Yes: Parks, Desai, Lester, Caldwell

No: None

Motion approved

7. The Commission considered SP 154A, Aspen Park Baptist Church, 5.5 acres, R-2/SP 154A (proposed), one-quarter mile north of Florence Street on the west side of Aspen Avenue. Farhad Daroga presented the background and left the meeting. Brent Murphy added that SP 154 was approved in 2001, specific use permits are approved subject to platting. He said SP 154 was not platted as required by ordinance and the specific use permit has expired. He said the church still plans to expand and they have submitted a conceptual site plan. He reviewed the recommended conditions.

Joe Donelson, 17440 South 89th East Avenue, Bixby, project engineer, asked that the specific use permit be approved.

Angela McDaniel, 2317 West Waco Street, Broken Arrow, Aspen Park homeowners association president, representing 130 families, asked if this item could be continued to give her time to present the facts to the homeowners association. She said the majority of the homeowners do not have the correct information.

Ann Behles, 4333 South Beech Avenue, Broken Arrow, said she lives directly across the street from the church and will probably be the most affected by the 20,000 square foot building to be built. She expressed concern regarding the traffic and noise that would result from this building.

7.continued

Ms. Behles said she had no objection to the church as such, but wanted to make sure it impacts her as little as possible and could not imagine that a 20,000 square foot building right across the street from her would not impact her property value. She said she would like to see the building moved further from the neighboring homes. She said the church has been a very good neighbor, but she is concerned regarding future users and the problems they might cause.

Angela McDaniels said she has a majority vote of the homeowners to become a gated community. She said there is an entrance into the subdivision from the church and asked how that would affect them in becoming a gated community when that happens. Discussion followed and Ms. McDaniels said she could not say when the association would go forward with that change. She asked that the detention pond the church plans to install be explained and Joseph Watt explained that it would normally be dry, and would hold runoff when it rains. Ms. McDaniels expressed concern regarding the safety issue with children that might pose.

Mike Lester asked if the church has thought of meeting with the homeowners.

Tom Clark, 3304 South Elder, Broken Arrow, said the church would be glad to meet with the homeowners and does not wish to cause a problem. Mike Lester said the unknown often creates undue fears and recommended this be continued to the next meeting to provide the opportunity for a meeting. Mr. Clark said he can recommend that the church attempt a meeting and if stipulations are placed on the project, those will be dealt with. He requested that the specific use permit be approved to allow them to see what is possible. Discussion followed.

Motion by Mike Lester to recommend approval of SP 154A as recommended by Staff. The motion was seconded by Kal Desai. Johnnie Parks asked when a meeting between the church and the homeowners would take place. Mike Lester said before any further development takes place.

Yes: Parks, Desai, Lester, Caldwell

No: None

Motion approved

Renate Caldwell said this item would be considered by the City Council on February 17, 2003.

8. The Commission considered SP 84A, All Saints Catholic School, 3.41 acres, C-3, one-third mile north of Houston Street on the east side of Lynn Lane, Robert D. Sanders, (Applicant). Brent Murphy presented the background, saying this for the All Saints Catholic School at St. Anne's Catholic Church, located at 301 South 9th Street. He said the school plans to add a parking lot and gymnasium on the recently purchased portion of the property along with a private drive that exits onto Lynn Lane.

Jim Freeman, 4716 East 106th, Tulsa, agent for the owner, said there has been some concern that a building would be constructed on the piece of property just purchased. However, that property will be used for access and to accommodate parking. The parking lot is to be centrally located so it does not interfere with any area close to residential property. The area between the apartments, all the way to the parking lot will be a playground. Additional expansion to the gymnasium would be classrooms and they would be placed to the south end of the gymnasium on the present school property. He said this is the ten-year plan.

8. continued

Bob Burns, 8180 South 257th East Avenue, said Lily Burns owns the apartments contiguous to the church property and he is here with her. He said neither of them understood what is planned for the property adjacent to the apartments. He said there is a playground abutting her property on the south and it looks as though one is planned on the east side. There is a slight drainage problem on the north that drains onto her property

Johnnie Parks said the city will ensure that there won't be any increase in flooding in the parking lot area and that the property will be well maintained. He said it will just be open property in the back.

Lily Burns, 109 South 9th, manager and owner of the apartments, said her concern is having something really close to the apartments on the land purchased by the church. She said there are 12 apartments on that side and the building has two stories. She said she is concerned about noise in that area because she has a number of tenants who work at night and sleep during the day. She said it is a very quiet complex and if a playground is put in, she didn't understand just where it was going to be.

Mr. Freeman outlined how the property would be developed. and he and Mrs. Burns exchanged remarks.

Mr. Burns asked what will happen next and Brent Murphy said tonight's request is for a specific use permit for a church and an affiliated school (both existing uses).

Jerry Glen, 10501 South Garnett Road, said his role is to assist the church in acquiring this property and that is still in process. He said he receives the tax bill because he is still the owner. He said he visited with Mrs. Burns. Brent Murphy said the application was signed by John Vogt as property owner and if Mr. Glen is the property owner, it needs to be confirmed that he is in agreement with the request for a specific use permit. Mr. Glen replied in the affirmative.

Brent Murphy said Staff recommends approval of SP 84A, subject to the property being platted. He said the preliminary plat has been approved. In addition to the platting, the applicant will need to submit a site and landscape plan to the Planning Commission.

Motion by Mike Lester to recommend SP 84A as recommended by Staff. The motion was seconded by Kal Desai.

Yes: Parks, Desai, Lester, Caldwell

No: None

Motion approved

9. **ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA**

- 4A. The Commission considered PT03-100, DN03-100, Piper Addition preliminary plat, 1.08 acres, 1 lot, C-3, (BAZ 1446) 904 West Kenosha Street, Ronald G. Tracy (Engineer). This item was removed from the Consent Agenda as requested by the applicant. Brent Murphy presented the background.

Ron Tracy, P.O. Box 52298, Tulsa, engineer on this plat, said No. 10 on the checklist limits the number of access points on Kenosha to one and said he would like two or three because there are two buildings are planned on one parcel. He said there are presently two driveways and he would like to retain them, 125 feet apart.

- 4A. Brent Murphy said Staff recommends the second access point be a mutual access point shared with the property to the east, but three access points would be unacceptable. Mr. Tracy said he would like to retain the two current driveways and would be agreeable to the shared access, if that is attainable. Discussion followed.

Joseph Watt said the Engineering Department has almost completed, through a consultant, the plans for the widening and improvement of Kenosha and would like for Mr. Tracy to meet with the consultant, whatever the Planning Commission decides about ingress and egress on this piece of property, as this job will be advertised for bid very soon. Johnnie Parks said he does not have a problem with two access points, as long as they are at opposite ends of the property, and it would be better if the driveway to the east could be moved to provide a mutual access point with the neighboring property.

Mr. Tracy also talked about the 60 feet right-of-way and Brent Murphy said that on the preliminary plat itself there is a note that states there is an existing 60-foot right-of-way, with a book and page number. It also shows on the plat ten feet of right-of-way to be provided. So the applicant needs to clarify whether the 60 feet has already been provided as it states on the plat, or if it has not been provided, does the applicant plan to provide the ten additional feet through the platting process. So, the intent of the comment is for the applicant to provide clarification of what right-of-way has already been provided and what is to be provided with this plat.

Joseph Watt said that ten additional feet was listed on the plat as a telephone easement with a book and page. Engineering asked for clarification as to whether the ten-foot was a right-of-way or easement. He said they have this property listed as a taking in the right-of-way for the Kenosha project, so that matter needs to be cleared up before plans can be released, as this is a federal aid project.

Mr. Tracy said that since there are two parcels of land there, you will find a sixty-foot right-of-way on each parcel and when the plat has been recorded there will be a sixty-foot right-of-way across the front of the entire property. Discussion followed.

Johnnie Parks asked how this will affect the Kenosha project. Joseph Watt said if the City has the 60-foot dedication on this plat, it will save the City time and money. Johnnie Parks asked Mr. Tracy what his time-table was for completion of his project and Mr. Tracy replied that it depended on what they find out about the shared access point. Discussion followed.

Motion by Mike Lester to approve the Piper Addition preliminary plat as recommended by Staff, with a 60-foot right-of-way provided and with a mutual access agreement on the east side of the property frontage, if agreeable with the property owner of the adjoining property, and if not, two points of access will be allowed. The motion was seconded by Kal Desai.

Yes: Parks, Desai, Lester, Caldwell

No: None

Motion approved

10. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

None.

10. **REMARKS, INQUIRIES AND COMMENTS BY PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF**
(NO ACTION)

None.

11. **Motion** by Mike Lester at 7:38 p.m. to adjourn. Motion seconded by Kal Desai.
Yes: Parks, Desai, Lester, Caldwell
No: None
Motion approved.